DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 181 849 HE 012 275

AUTHOR Giles, Geoffrey
TITLE Higher Education in Yugoslavia. Yale Higher Education Research Group Working Paper.
INSTITUTION Yale Univ., New Haven, Conn. Inst. for Social and Policy Studies.
SPONS AGENCY Lilly Endowment, Inc., Indianapolis, Ind.
REPORT NO YHERG-39
PUB DATE Dec 79
NOTE 40p.
AVAILABLE FROM Higher Education Research Group, Institution for Social and Policy Studies, Yale University, 1732 Yale Station, New Haven, CT 06520

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Access to Education; *College Administration; College Faculty; College Role; Degrees (Titles); *Educational Change; Educational Development; Educational Finance; *Educational History; Foreign Countries; *Governance; Government School Relationship; *Higher Education; Political Influences; Power Structure; *Teacher Role; Testing; Vocational Schools
IDENTIFIERS *Yugoslavia

ABSTRACT

Historical data and the current status of higher education in Yugoslavia are examined. Among the reforms enacted was the General Law on Faculties and Universities of 1960. The major and most immediate effect was probably the explosive expansion of institutions, particularly between 1960 and 1963. Additionally, higher education was no longer concentrated in the republican capitals, since towns acquired faculties and colleges of their own. By the mid-1960s, there were too many institutions and in the latter half of the decade a number of institutions were closed. It is the autonomous faculty that is the main unit in Yugoslavian higher education. In 1977-78 in addition to the 180 faculties institutions, there were 15 art academies and art faculties, 5 specialized colleges, and 139 vise skoles, or two-year advanced vocational colleges. Although not a part of the higher education network, there are also Workers' Universities. Faculties have developed around a single or small group of related disciplines since the 1960s, rather than representing a broad grouping of subjects. The university is a voluntary association of faculties and colleges and its powers revolve around making recommendations. The following areas are also addressed: the role of the Faculty Council, the function of the vise skole, access to higher education, examinations, the duration of higher education study and degrees conferred, educational finance, and political influences on higher education in the 1970s. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED181849

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Yale Univ
InSPS

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

HE 012 275

HIGHER EDUCATION RESEARCH GROUP

Institution for Social and Policy Studies

YALE UNIVERSITY

New Haven, Conn. 06520

HIGHER EDUCATION IN YUGOSLAVIA

by

Geoffrey Giles

YALE HIGHER EDUCATION RESEARCH GROUP
WORKING PAPER

YHERG-39

December 1979

Geoffrey Giles
Research Associate (1978-1979)
Higher Education Research Group

The research reported in this paper has been part of the work conducted by the Yale Higher Education Research Group. It has been supported by research funds from the Lilly Endowment grant for the comparative study of academic organization and governance.

In the interest of fullest possible circulation of information and ideas, the Higher Education Research Group reproduces and distributes these Working Papers at the request of authors who are affiliated with the Group. The views expressed are those of the authors.

A list of the Working Papers of the Group may be obtained from the address below.

Higher Education Research Group
Institution for Social and Policy Study
Yale University
1732 Yale Station
New Haven, Connecticut 06520

Higher Education in Yugoslavia

The fierce, nationalistic rivalries which have characterized the constituent republics of present-day Yugoslavia over the centuries have left their peoples with little shared identity. Most think of themselves not primarily as Yugoslavs, but as Serbs or Slovenes, for example, or as a member of one of the often sizeable minority groups (e.g. Albanians or ethnic Moslems). Indeed, it has been said that the inhabitants of Yugoslavia are united only by a common misunderstanding of their ancestry and a common dislike of thier neighbors.

It is not surprising, then, that massive resentment came to be felt, particularly by non-Serbs, at the concentration of political and administrative power in Belgrade on the usual Communist model of strict centralisation. Although Tito's government did for a while after Yugoslavia's expulsion from the Cominform in 1948 strive to prove their respectability in the Communist world by being more stalinist than Stalin, internal pressures from various national groupings forced them to embark upon a program of gradual devolution of power to the constituent republics. The party ideologists of the League of Communistsof Yugoslavia (LCY) quickly realised the propaganda potential in propounding this as a more literal, correct and just form of communism than that practised anywhere in the socialist bloc.

It is perhaps surprising in a socialist country to find that in the crucial area of higher education there is no unified system. The complete absence of any national coordinating force here must, however, be seen in the light of Tito's belief that in order to promote the development of the country as a whole, once its expulsion from the Cominform left it politically and economically on its own, the constituent republics should be given full rein to improve themselves (with some help from federal funds for the more backward

regions). This has, however, been a gradual process, as the concept of workers' self-management, introduced in the factories in the 1950s, steadily spread over into all social, cultural and economic activities in the public sphere. The country has undergone an enormous change in its economic base since the Second World War. In 1963, the agricultural population still totalled 61%, though by 1971 only 36% lived off the land. The concomitant blossoming of industry in such a backward country made it essential to raise the general level of education. In 1953, a full quarter of all Yugoslavs were illiterate but by 1971 the proportion had been cut to 15%, most of them older people (only 3.4% of ten to nineteen-year-olds were illiterate by this stage).[1] In order to achieve this, elementary school attendance was made compulsory for seven years (in 1945), and subsequently eight years (by the 1952 School Act), although building and staffing problems thwarted the complete realisation of this even in the 1970s. Secondary education (from ages 16-19) is still not compulsory, though rather less than half the age group (39% in 1970/71) now take this option at either the gimnazija or one of the technical, vocational or art schools. The first of these, the grammar school, is the most direct route to higher education. A formally equivalent leaving certificate (matura) is however awarded to successful graduates of all secondary schools. In the period following the establishment of the Yugoslav Kingdom in 1918, there were only three universities, at Belgrade, Zagreb and Ljubljana, and a few vocational colleges in other towns, whose number rose to 24 by 1939. Along with two pedagogical institutes, they represented a total student enrollment of the eve of the Second World War of 16,900.

The Period of Reform

The major reform of Yugoslav higher education was initiated by a Joint Commission of the Federal Assembly and the Federal Executive Council

set up in July 1957. The five sub-committees and 32 working parties of the Joint Commission made extensive enquiries, resulting in 19 volumes of tabulated documentary material, plus 11 volumes of descriptive text. While they were still in the very midst of of their labours, which lasted a full two years, the Federal Chamber of the Federal Assembly took the first steps in June 1958 to reorganise higher education with a "Recommendation" which identified four major tasks:

a) the Faculties should set aside their lengthy, theoretical training and concentrate on a more practical preparation for working life, at the same time shortening their courses to a norm of four years

b) every effort should be made to ensure that students finished their courses of study on time

c) an improvement in facilities and personnel was needed, as was the establishment of long-term development plans

d) the sytematic organisation of postgraduate courses was required, in order to train top specialists and researchers.[2]

Although action was immediately taken to begin the streamlining process on the one hand, and to start up a massive building programme on the other, these efforts were merely a prelude to the extensive provisions laid down in the federal government's General Law on Faculties and Universities of 1960, which amended and superceded the 1954 Universities Act. The General Law called for the following:

a) the splitting of undergraduate education into two separate levels, followed by a third postgraduate level;

b) special examination provisions for the express graduation of exceptional students;

c) the right of all citizens of access to higher education, provided that those without the secondary school mature (though with work experience) passed an entrance examination;

d) the integration of part-time study (the "Resolution" also called on the Faculties to provide facilities for part-time study to working people);

e) facilities for students to do practical work in enterprises;

f) the promotion of co-operation between Faculties and external bodies interested in advanced training.[3]

The extent to which professors adhered to this legislation will be examined below. Perhaps the major and most immediate effect was the explosive expansion of institutions, particularly between 1960 and 1963. The academic year 1960/61 alone saw the opening of 16 new Faculties, 3 new departments detached from existing Faculties, 3 new Specialized Colleges, and, in the fastest growing sector of all, 44 new više škole or advanced vocational colleges.

Whereas previously, higher education had been concentrated almost exclusively in the republican capitals--there were Faculties and Colleges in only 10 towns in 1959/60, and više škole in only 21--these figures more than doubled over the decade. In the first three years following the 1960 Law, even more than that were founded: 14 towns acquired Faculties and Colleges of their own, while some existing Faculties opened branches in other localities; and više škole opened in 59 mainly provincial towns. This, then, did much to relieve the pressure on the main urban centres for the expansion of higher education, while at the same time the decentralisation of institutions did much to spread and increase opportunity.

There was, however, another side to the coin. Expansion cheerfully proceeded at such a cracking pace that overall planning and co-ordination was virtually non-existent. Every town wanted a College or Faculty, and most now suddenly found themselves not only permitted but encouraged to start one. At this stage a diversified pattern of studies and levels of an almost ad hoc nature seemed quite appropriate for the rapid industrial development

then taking place. The work force was so unskilled and unprepared that there was a ready market somewhere for almost any training offered. It was only after the event that diversification was perceived as having been allowed to wander into an exaggerated fragmentation. There were by the mid 1960s too many institutions, which by a duplication of efforts in certain areas produced too many graduates. Moreover, the expansion had quickly created a shortage of teachers, and subsequent hiring of inadequately qualified staff led to a clear drop in academic standards. The disorganisation of the 1960 reforms led in the latter half of the decade to the closing of a number of institutions which were neither large nor useful enough to be maintained separately. This occurred especially in the višâ škola sector, where 27 institutions were shut down between 1966 and 1970, though only in the more developed republics (12 in Serbia, 11 in Croatia, 3 in Slovenia, and 1 in Macedonia).[4] The 1970s have seen further trimming, largely in the form of the amalgamation of small and dwindling units with larger institutions.

The fact that there are today 18 universities in Yugoslavia tells us little about expansion, for the university is not recognised as the central unit of teaching, research or administration.[5] Rather, the university is a voluntary interest group, consisting of a number of faculties. It is the autonomous faculty which is the main unit in Yugoslav higher education, and indeed the very distinctive feature of this system. In higher education overall, there are two major sectors, and two minor ones. The Faculties lead in the number of institutions, but are followed closely by the više škole, the sector of two-year advanced vocational colleges which grew explosively in the 1960s. Fifteen art academies and colleges form a separate sector, followed by a diminshing handful of specialist colleges of technology, economics, organizational studies, music, and physical education. The relative strengths of the sectors for the academic year 1977/78 are given in Table I below:

Table I

Higher Education Sectors during the Academic Year 1977/78

	No. of institutions	Total students	Full-time students	Part-time students
Faculties	180	293,361	214,115	79,246
Art Academies and Art Faculties	15	3,388	3,026	362
Specialized Colleges	5	8,066	3,802	4,264
Vise Skole	139	119,560	51,131	68,429
Total	336	424,375	272,074	152,301

Source: Statistički Godišnjak Jugoslavije 1978

Mention should also be made at this point of the Workers' Universities, although they are neither true universities nor part of the higher education network. Their antecedents are the still existing People's Universities, the earliest of which dates from 1907. Somewhat similar to the German Volkshochschulen, these latter aimed at popular education through lectures, debates and literary evenings. In 1952, two years after the introduction of workers' self-management, moves were made, usually by the trade union leadership of a district, to replenish through the creation of special Workers' Universities the educational deficiencies of workers, which were hampering the self-management process. Although the People's Universities do fulfil such serious demands as providing courses for illiterates, theirs is largely an amateur audience. The Workers' Universities are concerned rather less with general cultural education, and more with the urgent educational needs of a particular group of workers, which may include technical training. A few of these institutions specialize in management training for trade union leaders, and are accorded secondary school status.[6]

The University and Faculties

The role of the university appears to be general rather than specific in scope. There has been a recent swing back to its increasing importance as a co-ordinating body, but its formal tasks have not altered markedly from those laid down in the 1960 General Law:

a) to promote uniform teaching and research among the institutions in its sphere, and to organise inter-disciplinary co-operation between them and related organisations.

b) to provide independent teaching in disciplines which are covered inadequately or not at all by the constituent institutions

c) to arrange for the publication of text books needed by students

d) to set up halls of residence, refectories etc. for the financial, medical and material welfare of the students, and, by building faculty housing etc., to improve the working conditions of teachers

e) to represent the constituent institutions in dealings with third parties

f) to be generally responsible for all questions relating to the students, teachers and activities of the constituent institutions

g) to conduct any other activity of common interest to the institutions, subject to its statutory competence.[7]

The basic organ of self-government of the university is the University Council. This consists of two members elected by each of the constituent Faculties, and one student representative from each Faculty; delegates elected by the Assembly of the republic from the ranks of scientific, professional and other public workers; one member representing the municipal assembly of the university town; and members elected by interested economic organizations and professional associations. The Council is elected generally for a two-year term. The

rector serves as the representative head of the university, and is elected from among the professors by the University Assembly. The latter body, meeting annually, acts primarily as a forum for discussion among representatives of the academic and non-academic staff and students.[8]

This sounds rather like the system in many other countries. The important, indeed unique difference is that the University Council can not legislate for its constituent parts. The University is not the master, but the handmaiden of the Faculties. This derives from its very nature as a voluntary association of Faculties and Colleges. Its powers, then, are chiefly confined to making recommendations, which may or may not be accepted by the Faculties. Zagreb University, for example, attempted to integrate research efforts by forming certain university institutes, and to fill the need for the teaching of certain subjects with university-level courses. Its efforts met, if not with actual blocking, with severe delaying tactics on the part of the Faculties.[9] It is probably the ardent enthusiasm for autonomy on the part of the Faculties which leads them to a suspicion of any initiative emanating from another body. The recent voluntary increase in the number of universities (from seven in 1967, to thirteen in 1975, to eighteen in 1977) suggests that the fear of encroachments is at last being put aside in the realization of the absolute necessity of some impartial co-ordination.

Even as late as 1973, however, a "problem of guild-like, discipline-based seclusion and mutual mistrust" among the Faculties was acknowledged to be "unfortunately still very strong", hampering the efforts of the University.[10] It often proved easiest to set up inter-faculty units in premilitary education or physical culture, in which individual Faculties had no vested interest. From there, further innovations followed, such as the setting-up of a Council of Departments of Mathematics at the University of Belgrade, comprising all mathematics teachers in the various Faculties. At

the University of Niš meanwhile, an actual inter-Faculty department of mathematics was founded, along with similar units for physics, social education, and national defence. At Sarajevo, all the different types of engineering Faculties pooled their resources to form a joint Mathematics Department, where previously the individual Faculties had hired their own separate teachers in this subject.[11]

Thus the task of the rector seems to be one of co-ordination rather than leadership. His position still carries some prestige, but in the words of one rector, he has "the glory but not the power".[12] A fair amount of routine work does accumulate in the rectorate, sufficient to warrant the support of (usually) three pro-rectors. Two of these, like the rector himself, are drawn from the ranks of the faculty and serve a two-year term. Their respective duties cover academic affairs, and finance. The third pro-rector, responsible for international affairs, is not a professor but simply an administrator. He deals with the exchange agreements with foreign institutions. About six hundred foreign students study at the University of Sarajevo, for example, on the basis of some twenty-five exchange programs.

Faculties have developed round a single or small group of related disciplines since the 1960s, rather than representing a broad grouping of subjects. In 1977, for example, the University of Zagreb had 22 Faculties; Belgrade University had 23 in 1978.[13] The setting-up of new Faculties demands the ultimate approval of the Republican Assembly, but the initiative may come from above or below. Each Faculty is governed by a Faculty Council, elected from and by the faculty, students and community at large. As is usual with all organs of government in Yugoslavia, there are substantial differences of composition and practice between the various republics. At Sarajevo, the Philosophical Faculty's Council comprises the following members:

13 Faculty delegates (academic and non-academic staff)
13 students

13 delegates from local communes and political organizations
3 delegates from the Republican Assembly of Bosnia-Herzegovina
2 delegates from the Central Committee of the League of Communists
2 delegates from the Socialist Alliance of Working People of Yugoslavia
1 delegate from the Educational Research Institute
4 delegates from organisations and associations of the city of Sarajevo
1 delegate from the local commune (Sarajevo Center).[14]

It can be seen, then, that the nominal Drittelparität is in fact weighted towards the external representatives. This reflects the current philosophy that the "consumer" of higher education, i.e. society at large, should have the major voice in its organisation and conduct. This is of course a basic precept of the self-management system and holds true for all other areas outside education as well. Nonetheless, as one finds in other socialist systems, the academicians still retain control over a number of Faculty affairs. The full Faculty Council meets to discuss general questions and to consider reports of sub-committees. It must draw up the statute of the Faculty, approve the budget, the curriculum, the development plan and the research plan, endorse agreements with sponsoring communities of interest, appoint professors and assistants, and elect a dean. On the other hand, only the professors and students meet to discuss the organisation of teaching, the deployment of faculty, the formulation of the annual financial report and budgetary estimate, and on questions of awards and prizes, conditions of work, and postgraduate study. Only they elect the academic members of the Executive Council of the Faculty. This body, which conducts the day-to-day business of the Faculty, consists of a dean, three vice-deans and one external representative. The Faculty Council solicits advice in most matters from one of its five standing commissions, which cover respectively teaching, discipline, student affairs, personnel questions, and accommodation. The last named may seem rather unusual to Western eyes, but because of the housing shortage in Yugoslavia each Faculty considers it part of its task to provide accomodation not only for students but also for its teaching

members. Part of the portfolio of the pro-rector for financial affairs at Sarajevo University also concerns the provision of subsidised faculty housing.

Some of the larger Faculties are subdivided into departments, though these do not enjoy administrative autonomy. The Philosophical Faculty at Sarajevo is divided into the following ten departments: Philosophy and Sociology; Pedagogy and Psychology; History; South Slavic Languages; Serbo-Croat Language; Slovenian Language and Literature; English Language and Literature; German Language and Literature; Oriental Languages and Literature; World Literature, Dramatic Arts and Librarianship.[15] At Belgrade the Faculty of Mathematics and Natural Sciences contains the following eight departments: Mathematics, Mechanics and Astronomy; Physical and Meteorological Sciences; Chemistry and Physical Chemistry; Biology; Geography; Tourism; Social Science; National Defence.[16] The inclusion of 'tourismological science' here is rather a surprise, but one may assume this to be an offshoot of the Geography Department. Tourism has become one of the most popular subjects for study in Yugoslavia - it is of great importance to the national economy, and is perceived of by students as leading to glamorous jobs.

The Study Year Councils are another important feature of the organisation of the Faculties. These comprise all students of a particular year of study (all third year students, say), together with the teachers who are assigned to instruct them. These councils deal with questions relating to the course of study (such as the format of examinations), and represent one of the most important channels for the expression of student opinion. They are not, however, full organs of self-management, vested with decision-making powers, although the Faculty Council is obliged to consider and respond to any proposal emanating from a Study Year Council. Finally, the Faculty has, in addition to its representative organs, a comprehensive forum for discussion in the form of the Faculty Assembly. This embraces all students and staff, and meets once

a year to debate the annual report of the Faculty.

The relinquishment of control over Faculties by republican and federal authorities and universities progressed in the following fashion. In 1960, the federal government decided that the speedy reform and expansion of higher education then required could be better managed and overseen at the level of the republics, which would enact their own legislation. In order to ensure the immediate implementation of the 1960 federal Reform Act, the Federal Government did however retain control until the passage of the republican bills. It was the 1960 reform which changed the relationship of the Faculty to the University. Whereas previously Faculties had been obliged to be attached to a University, the new allowance for independent Faculties meant that single units could be set up to meet specific local needs in smaller towns, where the creation of a whole new university was neither warranted nor financially viable. Throughout the 1960s, the concept of self-management steadily spread from industry to other sectors of public life, and devolution of control to the republics was reinforced by the 1963 Yugoslav Constitution and its subsequent amendments. In the years following 1965, the republics passed their own Higher Education Acts. These allowed Faculties and other colleges increasingly to regulate most of their affairs by their own statutes, in particular after the Federal Assembly passed a Resolution in 1970 which formalised the concept of self-management in the education sector. Thus Yugoslavia went the way of the other socialist countries in assuming that the forms and methods of industrial management were entirely appropriate to the governance of higher education. The new Yugoslav Constitution of 1974 completely eliminated federal controls over education. At the republican level, however, a committee still retained control over some aspects of organisation, notably the financing of higher education, and these bodies have not on the whole become progressively weaker.

The Više Škole

In many ways, these two-year advanced vocational colleges are among the most successful examples of short-cycle higher education to have arisen in the last twenty years. A 1976 OECD study praised them for fulfilling their original function without any pretensions to "academic drift" such as one finds among the British polytechnics.[17] This author's delicate probings revealed, however, that the attitude is no different from other countries - there is nothing that a viša škola would like more than to enjoy the prestige of becoming a fully-fledged Faculty. No steps can be taken toward upgrading the status of a viša škola until (in Croatia, at least) it has managed to attract to its academic staff at least five professors with a doctorate, and ten with a master's degree - not an easy task for many small towns, as holders of advanced degrees tend to shun them in favor of the cities. This, incidentally, has proved a problem in the development even of Faculties in the more backward areas of southern Yugoslavia. One Belgrade professor, for example, told the author that he would not accept a post at Skopje even if offered three times his present salary.

The function of the više škole was and is to train middle-level staff in an expanding industrial economy where development was proceeding so rapidly that on-the-job training was no longer considered to be adequate. The viša škola's task was to add a vocational element to the general education of successful secondary-school graduates. In realisation of the even more urgent need for large numbers of well-trained middle-level staff than upper-level, the više škole were allowed to expand much more quickly than the Faculties. Many of the concomitant problems of hasty expansion which the Faculties experienced, particularly with regard to the maintenance of academic standards, applied in this sector also. Nonetheless, the high level of decentralisation which accompanied educational growth in the 1960s worked to the mutual benefit of

provincial industry on the one hand, and the employment prospects of graduates on the other, as close links were forged at the local level with the employment sector, which helped shape the curricular emphasis of the individual *više škole*.

These colleges generally specialize in a certain area, the largest number being the forty-two pedagogical *više škole*, which train teachers for the primary sector. The 7,504 graduates from these colleges in 1977 represented 39% of all *viša škola* graduates for that year. It is interesting to note that 63% of these teacher-training graduates were part-time students, and 67% of them were women (the national average for all women students is 39%). The other main sub-sectors are the technical and the economic *više škole*, with 30 and 15 institutions respectively. The economic colleges have the largest number of students of all types, but the fact that these two-year colleges graduated only 3,603 students in 1977 out of an enrolment that year of 33,004 (that is, 11% where one would expect 50%) highlights dramatically the perennial Yugoslav problem of delayed graduation and a high drop-out rate. Nevertheless, the *više škole* seem no worse than the Faculties in this respect, and the 19,215 students graduating from *više škole* in 1977 were not far short of the Faculties' 25,192.[18] The 1976 OECD study found a great deal of satisfaction of the students with these institutions. Whereas 64% of polytechnic students in Britain had attempted to gain admission to a university, a full 90% of *viša škola* students entered it as their first choice. It is perceived as being lower in hierarchical terms than the Faculty (though the *viša škola* diploma is *supposed* to be the recognized equivalent of the first two years of Faculty course work), yet is also viewed by the students as providing them with a better, more practical preparation for working life.[19] Yugoslav studies have shown that university students judge the route to a good job to lie primarily through one's "connections" and only secondarily by acquiring higher qualifications.[20] Yet this may not apply quite so much to the middle-level. The

viša škola diploma is clearly viewed as a beneficial terminal qualification, which aids social mobility. There is a difference in social class between Faculty and viša škola students: the former tend to come from non-manual families, where the latter are recruited more from the families of manual workers. Moreover, two-thirds of the viša škola students come from technical and vocational secondary schools, only one-third from the grammar schools.

Access and Examinations

As mentioned above, the matura gives the right of access to higher education, and until 1959 was the only recognised qualification for entry. In March of that year, the Federal Executive Council ruled that persons without the formal qualification should henceforth be eligible for entry to Faculties and colleges. This opened the door to students from the lower vocational and apprentices' schools, but also to viša škola graduates, who had not previously been permitted to advance to a higher institution. Indeed, even candidates with no formal academic qualifications (but with at least four years' work experience) were granted access, provided they could pass a competitive entrance examination, which was instituted for all candidates with the matura. The syllabus for the examination was published a year in advance. Figures for the first few years show less than a 20% pass rate on this examination, which probably reflects the concern not to increase further the already high dropout rate by admitting students unable to cope with their course work.[21] Thus while there is in Yugoslav very open access de jure to higher education, admission is in fact heavily restricted by the institutions.

In general terms, Faculties have held entrance examinations for some or all categories of candidates, whenever the numbers of applications received is considered more than desirable. Regular admission depended solely on an assessment of the candidate's general school performance and/or proficiency

in the proposed subject of major study. Where there was a restricted entrance examination, those students with an "excellent" or "very good" grade on their matura were declared exempt and admitted without further ado. The 1960 University Act forbade the restriction of enrolment at individual Faculties for all but exceptional cases e.g. where it was quite impossible to organize instruction for all the applicants. Moreover, the 1964 School Act decreed that all secondary school graduates with the matura should enjoy equal rights of access to any institution of higher education. However, the Faculties took little notice of these laws and persisted in their practice of holding competitive examinations whenever they saw fit.[22] The devolution of control over Faculties left them even freer to regulate access as they wished. Consequently, there is no standard admission procedure. Criteria vary from Faculty to Faculty (even within the same University) and according to the fluctuation of numbers from year to year.

Part of the reason behind the decision by Faculties to maintain the option of restricted access was the spectre of uncontrollable overcrowding raised by the rush of applicants to part-time study in the early 1960s. Whereas in the academic year 1959/60, only 16 Faculties (Law, Economics and a few Arts) offered facilities for external students, 54 Faculties did so the following year, and in 1961/62 all except three Medical Faculties permitted this alternative route to graduation.[23] The backlog of people who had previously been unable to enter higher education created a huge initial surge of demand, which gradually declined from its peak of 30,684 part-time students in Faculties in 1961/62. In part this drop was due to the tendency of school-leavers to demand increasingly full-time higher education (which was accompanied by certain benefits, such as the delaying of military service). The Faculties did much themselves to discourage a further increase in part-time student numbers, by instituting higher fees for them, and stiffer entrance examinations.

External students, moreover, who are taught in afternoon, evening or Sunday classes or occasional seminars, often have insufficient guidance from the institutions, and little assistance from their work organisations, which are said frequently to hinder them directly or indirectly in their studies.[24]

This brings us to the high attrition rate in Yugoslav higher education. The expansion of the system has of course meant that a greater number of Yugoslavs than ever can enjoy some form of higher education. The proportion of the 20-24 age group in higher education has risen from 4.3% in 1955, to 10.1% in 1967, up to 20.2% in 1975.[25] Some 93% of gimnazija graduates, and 40% of technical and other secondary school graduates go on to higher education. What these figures do not reveal is the large number of students who fail to complete their course, which has long run at between 50-60%.[26] It is in an effort to curb this that preselection of freshmen continues to operate more as the rule than the exception. It is often considerably more than a mere formality. For the academic year 1974/75, applicants were rejected at some of the Faculties of Bosnia-Herzegovina in the following proportions:[27]

Architecture and town planning	70%
Law	52%
Medicine	51%
Economics	27%
Philosophy	23%

Traditionally the largest hurdle has been the examination at the end of the first year of coursework. Some 40% of the students fail to progress to their second year, either dropping out or repeating their first year. For example, of the 49,161 first-year enrolments at Faculties in 1966/67, 8,244 were in fact "repeaters". The problem is equally acute in the više škole, where in the same year there were 9,358 repeaters in a total enrolment of 53,001.[28]

In less serious form, the problem recurs up to the final year of course work. In 1957, there were 23,917 students who had completed all their coursework but were still attempting to pass the examinations necessary for graduation (some had been trying since before 1950!). Fifty-six per cent of them still required between five and nine examination passes.[29] The dropping off of students from one year of study to the next is illustrated in Table II.

It was in the light of the excessive time taken to complete studies that, even before the 1960 Reform, the 1958 Recommendations suggested a reduction from the average of seven years to a more reasonable four. This could easily be achieved, the Recommendation rather optimistically claimed, if students would only engage more diligently in their studies, and teachers would improve the effectiveness of their teaching.[30] The average study time did indeed decline over the next four years, but only from 6.1 years in 1959 to 5.8 years in 1964.[31] One hindrance was doubtless another part of the reforms, which shifted the focus altogether from a more general university education to a narrower, more advanced and more demanding specialist training. The problem continues to the present day, and Table III shows the proportion of full-time students who succeed in graduating within the scheduled time. The highest success rate has been consistently achieved by the Art Faculties, which may be a reflection of a different style of examination. The Agricultural and Silvicultural Faculties have enjoyed the worst records since 1973, hovering below 9%.[32] They are closely followed by the 10% average in the Faculties of Mathematics and Natural Sciences. It is difficult to judge whether this is the result of inadequate teaching or particularly stiff examinations in these areas. A recent Yugoslav study lists the following factors contributing to delayed graduation:

a) inadequate secondary education

b) a lack of diligence on the part of the students

c) certain unsettled material (i.e. financial) problems among the students

d) an unfavourable student/teacher ratio

e) the unsatisfactory material position of teachers, aggravating their tendency to take on extra work outside the Faculty

f) Numerus clausus, leading students to accept vacancies in subjects in which they have little interest or aptitude

g) the tendency of many to seek the status of student in order to enjoy its benefits (health protection, postponement of military service, etc.) at least for a short while.

TABLE II

Students by year of study in the academic year 1977/78

	1st year	2nd year	3rd year	4th year	5th year
Faculties					
All Students	119,957	72,025	57,282	33,790	10,024*
(Full-time Students)	(79,124)	(56,844)	(40,322)	(27,810)	(9,741)
Art Academies and Faculties					
All	932	876	818	627	135
(Full-time)	(845)	(802)	(685)	(559)	(135)
Specialized Colleges					
All	3,764	1,798	1,698	805	1
(Full-time)	(1,569)	(981)	(851)	(400)	(1)
Vise Skole					
All	85,704	31,851	2,288*		
(Full-time)	(33,716)	(16,138)	(1,551)		

*Largely medical and engineering students

Source: Statisticki Dodisnjak Jugoslavije 1978. Tables 126-12

TABLE III

Full-time students graduating at the scheduled time

	Faculties	Art Academies and Faculties	Specialized Colleges	Vise Skola
	%	%	%	%
1972	16.7	60.0	15.1	21.0
1973	15.4	58.6	23.4	18.3
1974	15.1	55.4	16.4	22.8
1975	16.9	57.4	19.4	25.1
1976	16.2	64.3	10.4	22.6
1977	17.1	62.8	35.5	21.4

Source: Statisticki Godisnjak Jugoslavije 1978. Tables 126-15

This spreads the blame rather widely and unspecifically, but it is interesting to note that the authors concede as an after-thought that the length of the course of studies at various Faculties has "(certainly) been unrealistically planned".[33]

The Yugoslavs have advanced only haltingly with curricular reform after the failure of their first attempt at a novel experimentation with split-level undergraduate study. The 1960 Act had proposed this reform of the traditional unitary course into two sections, each normally of two years' duration. It was not introduced in any uniform manner across the country. Some of those faculties which did accept the reform, for example, introduced it alongside regular four-year studies. By the academic year 1962/63, 55 Faculties, 10 colleges and 6 arts academies did not.[34] In general, it was unpopular and many Yugoslav academics could see no adequate justification for change. This reluctance to back the new scheme wholeheartedly largely explains its subsequent failure.

The chief (and very laudable) motivation behind split-level study had to do with the ease of transfer. The plan called for the recognition of

equality between the viša škola diploma and first-level study of the Faculties, which were also to issue an (optionally terminal) certificate after these first two years. This was to allow students of both sectors equal access to second-level study at the Faculties. As it was, the reform was translated into action (if at all) with too much haste and too little forethought and worked to the detriment of both sectors. The više škole, tailoring their curricula to fit smoothly with local needs, now found that they had to conform more closely to the often less appropriate curricula of the Faculties, in order to ease the transition of such of their students as desired to proceed to the second level. The Faculties, which traditionally favoured a lengthy and general theoretical training, accepted the need for a practical element in the first level training with bad grace and convinced themselves that all they were really doing was lowering their standards. They were also piqued to discover that, in contrast to the rather sought-after viša škola graduates, those Faculty graduates who left after the first-level often had considerable difficulty in finding employment.[35] And so in the academic year 1966/67, most Faculties which had introduced the split level reverted in defiance of the 1960 Reform Act to their traditional four-year courses. The main reasons given were that the majority of their first-level students continued on to second level anyway, and that they saw no good reason for providing the same training that the viša škola sector offered.[36] This left the više škole in a rather unclear position with regard to the possibility of transfer of their students. Indeed, a number of Faculties refused to recognize viša škola diplomas or even to give credit for the period of study undertaken in this sector.[37] These de facto difficulties of transfer between institutions, where they are legally not supposed to exist, only aggravate the whole problem of access, making Yugoslav higher education much more restricted than it outwardly would appear.

The ranking of academic qualifications is as follows. The viša-škola

diploma confers the appropriate professional title e.g. engineer, nurse, which is written after the name. The four-year Faculty or college course leads to a degree and the title of certified engineer (diplomirani inzinjer), certified nurse etc. Sometimes the specialty of the graduate is also indicated e.g. "Aleksandar Aleksic, certified agricultural engineer for stockbreeding". Similarly, all graduates of pedagogical Faculties, which produce secondary-school teachers, have the right to style themselves "professors" with the addition of their special subject e.g. professor of geography.

Postgraduate study, the third level proposed by the 1960 Act, leads in the first instance to either of two academic degrees, that of specialist degree being usually considered terminal and the master's more often as a step towards the doctorate. Teaching here is much less structured than with the undergraduate course and some critics consider the examination system, by which oral and written exams must be passed in a number of subjects before the final diploma project can be started, to be antiquated and irrational. In consequence, the formula of two or three semesters for a specialist degree, and four for a master's, is rarely adhered to, and postgraduate studies last four to five or even more years. As with other levels of study, many students enrol, particularly for the first year, but few complete the course. About half the students are supported by scholarships, often at the level of a salary, from their present or future employers; the rest obtain release from work for four or five days per month and study part-time. A lack of clarity on the definition of these two postgraduate degrees led to a perception of them as unequal. The master's degree was erroneously considered to be superior and a certain discrimination against specialists on the part of employers resulted.[38] The view apparently still prevails, as there seems little demand today for the specialist qualification. In 1977, only 92 specialists graduated in the entire country as compared with 1,808 masters.[39] The failure of the specialist level

of study in East Germany makes an interesting parallel; there too, the innovation failed to win the support of employers or students.

The highest degree is the doctorate, which is achieved through the successful defence of a doctoral thesis, after the completion of the master's degree. If the candidate already has a number of published works to his credit, the requirement of the master's degree may be waived, although an additional written doctoral examination is then required.

Theological studies take place in private colleges only. There are eleven colleges catering altogether for a mere thousand students, and they are considered to be outside the main system of higher education.[40]

The Finance of Higher Education

There have been several changes since the Second World War in the funding of Yugoslav higher education, yet all but the most recent have been more formal than real. As the concept of worker self-management spread into the educational sector in the mid 1950s, direct allocations from the federal budget were abandoned in favour of a network of buffer committees, which implied less blatant control by federal authorities. These independent committees, existing at the federal, republican and municipal levels, administered so-called Social Funds for Education. They were exhorted to demonstrate their independence from the federal government by seeking part of their finances in the form of grants and investments from local business and industry, and from the communes. This was only partially successful, for the Social Funds still had to rely upon budgetary allocations for over 85% of their income, and thus still felt a strong measure of indirect control.[41]

In 1966, the General Educational Finance Act was passed by the federal government, and on the basis of the provisions outlined in it, the individual republics enacted their own laws, modifying the system rather more. The funding

bodies now came to be known as Communities of Education, and existed at the republican and commune levels only. They derived their resources from

a) a special educational tax, paid by both employees and the self-employed

b) a proportion of the retail sales tax,

c) allocation by the republic or commune (usually requested to cover a deficit)

d) voluntary contributions from enterprises, government bodies or private groups.

There were separate Communities for elementary and for post-elementary education. Higher education, included in the latter group, had to share its resources with secondary education, and often came off rather badly. Furthermore, it was extremely difficult to predict the expected income for a given year. The amount accruing from the sales tax, for example, depended upon the rate of retail turnover. This had unfortunate consequences: in 1967, an overestimation at the University of Zagreb led to the necessity for a sudden and drastic trimming of full professors' salaries by 20 per cent.[42]

A further transferral of influence to the "consumers" of higher education, the work organisations who hire the graduates, resulted from the 1969 Educational Finance Act. Each organisation was now permitted to calculate into the prices of its products and services an educational surcharge in proportion to its perception of the benefits and value of the education that its employees had received.

The system of financing higher education since the Yugoslav Constitution of 1974 has sought to reduce further the role played by government bodies. The new constitution excluded any federal involvement in higher education, and also set down fresh guidelines for the socialisation of labour, and its further disentanglement from state influence. Croatia and the Vojvodina led the way

with new republican higher education laws, and most other republics still appear to be assessing the experimental forms of organization there before introducing actual changes themselves. The Croatian Higher Education Act of 5 April 1977 introduced as the new governing bodies the so-called Higher Education Communities of Interest (HECI).[43] In an attempt to introduce the concept of a "free exchange of labour" into relationships between labour organisations and the social service sector, these HECIs dovetail together with the communities of interest which govern other organizations of associated labour, all negotiating for financial support one with the other in a criss-crossing network of extraordinary complexity.

There are in Croatia HECIs a three levels. At the top stands the republican HECI as the coordinating agency for the whole of the Croatia, It collects the funds used to finance higher education, and then distributes them to four regional centres at Zagreb, Rijeka, Split and Osijek, While secondary education is then arranged along territorial lines by municipality, the next subdivision for higher education takes place along subject lines (e.g. engineering, philosophy, economics). There are forty-four of these HECIs in Croatia at the base level, though the capital, Zagreb, has twenty-four of them. Split, on the other hand, only has seven. The regional HECIs are regarded as the crucial proving-ground for funding requests, and it is here that most of the debate on the distribution of money takes place. Most of the republics, such as Bosnia-Herzegovina and Serbia have not yet set up HECIs at the regional level, and negotiations for funding take place in the single Republican HECI. There is, however, talk in Sarajevo that Bosnia-Herzegovina may also divide into regions in the future, following the Croatian model if it is seen to be successful.[44]

The only money which the republican HECI does not redistribute goes to cover items of central importance, such as in Croatia the main research

library, the National Republican Library in Zagreb. It also deducts three per cent of the funds that it handles, in order to cover its own running expenses, which are not always inconsiderable. Indeed, there has been some resentment in Zagreb that students, who were working in the offices of the Republican HECI in order to support their studies financially, were earning larger salaries than some of their professors! There is almost a ministerial air about these republican HECIs. The Bosnian HECI at Sarajevo is one of twelve republican communities of interest (for transport, postal services etc.), and employs a full-time staff of forty, divided into four departments, dealing with 1) the self-management process, 2) the development of new programmes, 3) academic standards, and 4) finance. It should moreover be pointed out that the HECI deals only with the teaching side of activities in higher education. There is an entirely separate network of communities of interest dealing with research. Yet the republican HECI does not have the powers of a traditional ministry. While it does, for example, play a prominent role in the setting-up of new Faculties, once they have been established, it does not have recurrent powers of inspection, and may not intrude directly into the affairs of the Faculty.

At least this is theoretically the case. Faculties in Zagreb were taken by surprise in the summer of 1978 when the Croatian HECI announced a numerus clausus for some of them restricting their intake of freshmen. There was alarm and outrage, accompanied by confusion over the legality of the move, but nevertheless the faculty's reaction was to pressurize the HECI for modification of the edict, rather than rejecting the numerus clausus outright. The implication of this is that the Republican HECI, by controlling the purse-strings, is increasingly prepared to exercise powers of governance in areas where until recently there was a marked lack of co-ordination. It is interesting to speculate on just how it was that the Faculties were caught by surprise

by the numerus clausus announcement, when their representatives make up one-third of the HECI's Assembly. It may be yet another manifestation of a common problem in the whole self-management system: the deliberations of communities of interest are tedious, and many delegates do not bother to attend assembly meetings, thus making it rather easier for the executive to push through its measures. Still, all decisions of the HECI must be ratified by the General Assembly of the republic. In Slovenia, where the Republican HECI had earlier also tried to impose a numerus clausus, it was rejected after a debate in the Republican Assembly and could not take effect.[45] The need for some national co-ordianation has long been acknowledged. Ironically, it was the Skopje earthquake in 1963 which brought home the problem to Yugoslav academics. After the disaster, teachers, and students from Skopje were adopted by other institutions throughout the country. A wide divergence of the level and content of teaching at supposedly similar institutions became immediately apparent. This perceived need for standardisation contributed to the halting of the indiscriminate expansion of the previous three years (1960-63), which had been carried out with a minimum of forethought or planning. Yet whereas the next few years saw a concern with the consolidation of the system, any co-ordinating attempts from the most obvious agency, the Federal Secretariat for Education and Culture, were given short shrift. When the Federal Secretariat proposed a new form of university by discipline e.g. all the Faculties of Engineering in a particular region should amalgamate to form an Engineering University, the idea was rejected out of hand. Even when federal agencies try to assist, they are treated with suspicion. The Federal Economic Chamber, enquiring about sources of educational funding in 1970, found that 24% of the Faculties and colleges, and 37% of the više škole, flatly declined to respond to its survey.[46]

It comes as no surprise to learn that there is no national scheme of grants for students. In the past, scholarships tended to come on an ad hoc basis from individual enterprises, as their own financial situation permitted.

This meant both that they were on average rather low (about one-third of an average worker's salary) and that there were too few of them. At the beginning of the 1960s only 29% of full-time students were receiving scholarships (some 8% received them at an amount equivalent to a regular salary, however).[47] In the mid-sixties, when enterprises were beginning to back down from outright cash gifts for students, whom they could often not then employ after graduation, due to a general tightening of the economy, the emphasis shifted to student loans which is the predominant form of student finance today. The Faculties administer special Student Loan Funds, some of the money for which derives from student fees, from which loans are awarded on a competitive basis. Repayment begins a year after graduation, or six years after matriculation whether the student has graduated or not, and may extend over a period of up to ten years. The repayment of a loan may be waived in the case of outstanding students. Some 40% of the students receive financial assistance in the form of loans or scholarships, but it should be borne in mind, say the Yugoslavs, that only "40% of all students study seriously and graduate; 60% are only an unnecessary burden on institutions of higher learning".[48] This overlooks the fact that those students who are forced to take part-time employment during full-time study are seriously hampered in their study efforts.

The Institutional Outlook

Yugoslavia offers a nice example of academic freedom taken by Faculty teachers to its logical conclusion. We have seen that the special circumstances which allowed this complete rejection of any guiding influence from above lay in the general trend to decentralised worker self-management on the one hand, and in the need for the rapid creation of new, small units of higher education on the other. In comparative perspective, one finds that when a central state agency strives to fashion a "system" of higher education by means of legislation

it merely creates future rigidities and hampers the always crucial ability for adaptation. But for the rapacious lust of Yugoslav academics for ever more autonomy, this was the way which Yugolavia might have gone after the 1960 Reform Act. The zest with which the academics pursued their increasing independence seems largely to have been a sort of game in which, incredulous at their success, they kept trying to push external control further and further back just to see how far they could go. The result was that federal, republican and finally local government controls over higher education were progressively curtailed. This phenomenon is by no means unique to the education sector, but forms part of the general movement of decentralisation, primarily to placate the nationalist groups, especially at the end of the sixties. It was hoped that if some of their demands were met, they might then see after all the value of working together for the greater good of Yugoslavia as a whole. But, as Professor Singleton points out:

> In fact, nothing like this occurred. The advance towards autonomy simply whetted the appetite of the extreme nationalists for even further devolution.[48a]

It has been said that the greatest single danger in the control of higher education is a monopoly of power.[49] Government lost out to academics over control of higher education in the 1960s, but the latter did not become a new monopoly. Whilst academics were the dominant force, they were obliged, in order to obtain their independence in the first place, to comply with socialist practices of power-sharing with other groups, notably the students, and interested agencies of the local community. The differences between administration and control should also be considered: in many systems administration is decentralised, and there may even be an illusion of considerable independence, while the ultimate reins of control continue to be held by the central ministry. Indeed, this is the usual socialist model of democratic centralism. This principle also held true for Yugoslavia, but was gradually

whittled away as the various levels of government formally divested themselves of their powers (most recently, in the 1974 Yugoslav constitution, abandoning federal involvement in higher education). Real control did, then, devolve to the Faculty level, eventually even in financial affairs, after federal funding had underwritten the main expansion.

Yet the struggle for independence was not waged for the sake of liberalising higher education. The revolution of Yugoslav academics was essentially a conservative one, to strengthen their oligarchy. The government's reform plans were essentially liberal and apposite. The building-up of the new više-škole gave industry the skilled middle-level personnel it needed, and conversely gave the middle-level personnel access to higher education which they would not otherwise have enjoyed in the already overloaded Faculty sector. The equalisation of the viša škola course with the 'first level' of Faculty studies was an attempt to break down hierarchical barriers. Moreover, the creation of the "first-level" was designed to introduce some differentiation into the one tier system, allowing those who did not make it right the way through four (or more) years to come away at least with some qualification. One might have expected Faculty teachers to welcome it also because it represented another screening device which could help selection for the "second level" and alleviate somewhat the high rate of failure. None of this was accepted by the Faculties. They strengthened the hierarchy by turning their backs on the viša škola and its students, they rejected the split-level study system, reverting to their old, traditional ways, and often reversing the partial modernisation of the curriculum, which had sought to lend a more practical slant to studies.

However, the Faculties alone did not dominate the structure (the second great danger to a higher education system). The više škole were already well established and successfully anchored. The demand for their graduates, as distinct from Faculty graduates, at the middle level ensured that they were

able to weather the potential danger of the Faculties' rejection. Today this sector is equally as strong and self-assured as the Faculties, largely because it too has been allowed to operate along the same lines of self-management as the Faculties, unlike the situation in many other countries where short-cycle higher education remains under the control of the state.

The mid-seventies have seen a double-edged development. Firstly, the Party has seen the need to re-assert itself more effectively in the overall direction of the country. This has meant a return to the Leninist principles of democratic centralism and stronger leadership (while remaining faithful to the concept of self-management). Secondly, institutions of higher education have recognised the necessity for greater co-ordination. However, this has not led to an invitation to the government for help in planning and development. All Faculties and colleges are now already part of, or are in the process of joining a university. The integration urge is so great that the old hierarchical boundaries are being abandoned, and više škole are also being accepted into the bosom of the university. The University of Sarajevo, for example, embraces both a Medical Faculty and a medical viša škola.

But if there is a little more good will within the academic world, there is still little love lost between professors and Party. The League of Communists has always been rather suspicious of the intellectual world, the natural haven for critics. While the student demonstrations in 1968 displayed different motives from place to place, all were agreed in their rejection of control of society by an elite of Communist Party apparatchiks.[50] Support of the League is not overly great among students: only one third are members in Belgrade, Skopje and Sarajevo, and only one fifth of the students in Zagreb and Ljubljana. And while membership is perhaps not as significant as support, one study has indicated that 40% of the students did not wholly accept the premises of Marxism, and give their own personal material well-being as the most important

factor in their lives.[51] Of course, while the students accuse the Party members of elitism, the Party counters with similar charges against the students, who live, it is claimed, "separated from the working class, from labour and from the milieu of self-management", and whom "technocratic and elitist infections" lead to "imagine that they have a special mission and role in society".[52] For several years following 1968, the Party in Serbia tried to discipline eight critical Belgrade professors without success. In 1974, the party organisation in the university made allegations that the dissident professors were unsuitable for their teaching posts on moral and political grounds. Eight independent commissions of enquiry of the university (one for each professor), which included professors from elsewhere and some lay members, all vindicated unanimously the accused professors. The Party had failed with this tactic, but thereafter tried to remove the professors from a position of influence over students by pressing them to take research posts, thus withdrawing from teaching, or by taking leaves of absence to teach abroad. When they still refused, the Serbian Assembly finally passed in January 1975 a resolution ordering that the eight professors should resign. This is a particularly telling example of how the Party, when all esle fails, is now willing to use the state apparatus to override university autonomy. Whilst there seems little which the Faculties could do to stop action of this kind in isolated instances, it does not appear likely that the Party will try to interfere regularly in the appointments process with political reliability tests and the like. An attempt to formalise political control would meet with just too great an outcry in the institutions, and probably would counter-productively breed dissent.

Overall, the Yugoslav self-management principle still prevails, that the advancement of various sectors of society is best served if they are left to control their own affairs. The diversification which accompanies this freedom is certainly more beneficial in the long run than monopolistic control. The

system is highly adaptable, which is essential to the success of any higher education system. A certain fossilisation may set in if the present pendulum swing towards greater co-ordination goes too far and places control in the hands of a single agency.

The two major problems which affect Yugoslav higher education today, the curriculum and finance, both might push the pendulum, the first probably less so. Aside from restricting access to higher education still further, the main way to reduce the high attrition rate lies with a thorough overhaul of the curriculum in order to make the achievement of a degree or diploma within the allotted time the norm rather than the exception. There are already plenty of academic associations which could tackle this problem, and the correct and acceptable manner for them to present their solutions would be in the form of recommendations. There is no need, nor any desire for an imposed solution which may not work anyway. Finance is a thornier problem altogether. Financial autonomy is all very well if one has a guaranteed source of income. And while, for Yugoslav higher education institutions, income is usually fairly stable, it is rarely sufficient. There are universal problems in persuading enterprises to invest adequately in education. If institutions cannot obtain enough support by their own efforts, it may be that, as elsewhere in the world, the rising cost of higher education will force them to fall back increasingly on government subsidies, with all the growing indirect control which that implies. The most pressing need, then, is for higher education to dress itself up as a more attractive investment, and this it can scarcely do as long as it impotently laments the failure of its curricular methods.

1. Zora Steinmann, "Development of the Schooling System and Changes in the Educational Composition of the Population", Yugoslav Survey XIII, 4, 1972, p. 118.

2. Cf. Reforms in Yugoslavia. Report prepared by the Institute for Social Research, University of Zagreb (Case Studies on Innovation in Higher Education), OECD Paris 1970, p. 35f.

3. Ibidem, p. 38f.

4. Marijan Filipović & Jelica Filipović, "Higher Education, 1960-70", Yugoslav Survey, XII, 3, 1971, p. 74.

5. The institutions were founded or gained university status on the following dates: Ljubljana (1813), Belgrade (1863), Zagreb (1874), Skopje (1946), Sarajevo (1949), Novi Sad (1960), Niš (1965), Priština (1969), Rijeka, Belgrade University of Arts (1973), Split (1974), Titograd, Banjaluka, Maribor, Osijek (1975), Kragujevac, Tuzla (1976), Mostar (1977).

6. "The Workers' Universities", Yugoslav Survey, I, 3, 1960, pp. 372-380; "The 'Moša Pijade' Workers' University in Zagreb", Yugoslav Survey, III, 8, 1962, pp. 1186-1192.

7. Reforms in Yugoslavia, p. 26f.

8. Marijan Filipović, Higher Education in Yugoslavia, Belgrade 1971, p. 89.

9. Reforms in Yugoslavia, p. 101f.

10. Gojko Stanič, "Problems of Introducing Interdisciplinary and Interfaculty Studies in the University of Ljubljana, Yugoslavia", Higher Education, 4, 1975, p. 63.

11. Filipović & Filipović, p. 87f.

12. Author's interview with Rector Professor Arif Tanović, University of Sarajevo, 8 September 1978.

13. Sveučilište u Zagrebu, Red Predavanja u Zimskom i Ljetnom Semestru Skolske Goldine 1976-1977, Zagreb 1977; Univerzitet u Beogradu, Pregled Predavanja za Skolsku 1977/1978 god., Beograd 1978.

14. Author's interview with Prof. Petar Madić, Philosophical Faculty, University of Sarajevo, 7 September 1978.

15. Univerzitet u Sarajevu, Pregled Predavanja 1977/1978, Sarajevo 1978, p. 75.

16. Univerzitet u Beogradu, Pregled Predavanja, p. 190ff.

17. Philippe Cibois & Janina Markiewicz-Lagneau, Students in Short-Cycle Higher Education. France, Great Britain and Yugoslavia, OECD Paris 1976.

18. Scijalistička Federativna Republika Jugoslavija Savenzni Zavod za Statistiku, Statisticki Godišnjak Jugoslavije 1978, Godina XXV, Beograd 1978, Table 126-14, p. 367-369.

19. Cibois & Markiewicz-Lagneau, p. 137.

20. Milosav Janićijević, Manojlo Brocić, Manojlo Cluščević, Jugoslav Stanković, Jugoslovenski Studenti i Socijalisam, Beograd 1966, p. 124.

21. "Enrolment at Faculties and Art Academies", Yugoslav Survey, I, 1, 1960, p. 84f; "Higher Education since the 1960 Reform", Yugoslav Survey, III, 10, 1962, p. 1486.

22. Marijan Filipović, "Higher Education, 1960-1966", Yugoslav Survey, VIII, 4, 1967, p. 105f.

23. "Higher Education since the 1960 Reform", p. 1487.

24. Filipović & Filipović, p. 81f.

25. Muris Osmanagić, "Natural Function of the Expansion of Higher Education", Univerzitet Danas, XVIII, 9-10, 1977, p. 66.

26. Filipović & Filipović, p. 85; Steinman, p. 116.

27. Branislava Peruničić, Muhamed Muradbegović & Tade j Mateljan, "Is Growing Interest for Studies Keeping Up With the Real Needs of Society?", Univerzitet Danas, XVIII, 9-10, 1977, p. 226ff.

28. Filipović & Filipović, p. 76.

29. Reforms in Yugoslavia, p. 32.

30. "Reform of Higher Education", Yugoslav Survey, I, 2, 1960, p. 251.

31. Filipović, "Higher Education, 1960-66", p. 111.

32. Statistički Godišnjak Jugoslavije 1977, Table 126-15, p. 370.

33. Božidar Jelčić & Arso Škorić, "Expansion of the University in the Contemporary Society", Univerzitet Danas, XVIII, 9-10, 1977, p. 18.

34. Filipović, "Higher Education, 1960-1966", p. 112.

35. Cibois & Mariewicz-Lagneau, p. 22f.

36. Cf. fn. 34.

37. Filipović & Filipović, p. 87.

38. Marijan Filipović, "Post-graduate Study", Yugoslav Survey, VII, 25, 1966, p. 3644.

39. Statistički Godišnjak Jugoslavije 1978, Table 126-17, p. 371.

40. Ibid., Table 126-16, p. 370.

41. Božidar Jelčić, "The Financing of Higher Education in Yugoslavia" unpublished paper 1978, p. 11.

42. Reforms in Yugoslavia, p. 152.

43. Excerpts of the Act in Joachim Köhler, "Der Hochschulbereich in Jugoslawien. Daten zu Organisation/Studium/Berufseingliederung" (Hochschulbildung in sozialistischen Staaten: Werkstattbericht 7), Deutsches Institut für Internationale Pädagogische Forschung, Frankfurt am Main 1978, p. 78ff.

44. Cf. fn. 14.

45. Author's interview with research staff at the Center for University Development, University of Ljubljana, 18 September 1978.

46. Filipović & Filipović, p. 94.

47. "Higher Education since the 1960 Reform", p. 1490.

48. Reforms in Yugoslavia, p. 129f.

48a. Fred Singleton, Twentieth-Century Yugoslavia, New York 1976, p. 272.

49. Burton R. Clark, "The Insulated Americans: Five Lessons from Abroad", Change, November 1978, p. 27.

50. Lev Detela, "The Yugoslav Student Revolt: an Attempt at Interpretation", Review (Study Centre for Yugoslav Affairs), 9, 1970, p. 771.

51. Janićijević, Brocić et al., pp. 378 & 125.

52. Uwe Bach, "Die jugoslawische Bildungspolitik im Spiegel des X. Parteitags des Bundes der Kommunisten Jugoslawiens (BdKJ)", Informationsdienst zum Bildungswesen in Osteuropa (Osteuropa-Institut an der Freien Universität Berlin), Heft 23 1974, p. 115.

INSTITUTION FOR SOCIAL AND POLICY STUDIES

The mission of the Institution for Social and Policy Studies (ISPS) is to encourage and undertake multidisciplinary research and education. The ISPS is oriented to the exploration of social problems rather than to the refinement of discipline-based methodology. In recent years, ISPS research has focused on the problems of the city, education, health service delivery, and on the modeling of social systems. Currently, research is also being developed on criminal justice, governmental reform, environment, income distribution, aging, the policy-making process, and value problems in public policy. ISPS is not a consulting organization but an instrument for enriching the social sciences and related disciplines in the University.

Higher Education Research Group
Institution for Social and Policy Studies
1732 Yale Station
New Haven, Connecticut 06520